



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY M. H. SEGAL, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

II

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.*

63. (ch. 22.) The author continues his narrative in ch. 22. There is no reason whatever to doubt, as some critics do, the genuineness of 22. 3-5. As soon as David openly becomes an outlaw his whole clan joins him, probably out of fear of Saul's revenge. But David would not expose his aged parents to the dangers of his roving existence, and so he entrusted them to the protection of the king of Moab. He was encouraged to do so both by the enmity which existed between Saul and Moab (cf. above, §§ 49, 57), and also by his connexion with the land of Moab through Ruth, his reputed ancestress (cf. R. Isaiah's note, *ad loc.*). That there was a prophet in David's company is not at all surprising, considering the unfriendly relations which existed between Samuel, the head of the prophetical order (19, 20 a), and Saul. Gad may have belonged to the school of Ramah, where David had vainly sought an asylum. The passage is, however, fragmentary. It tells us only indirectly that David stayed at the מזורה, which appears from ver. 5 to have been outside Saul's territory. But it does not tell us precisely where the מזורה was, how David lived there, or how Gad came to him.

* Continued from vol. VI, pp. 267 ff., and pp. 555 ff.

64. Many critics declare the account of David's visit to Nob in ver. 9 ff. to be independent of, and contradictory to, the account in 21. 2-10, and they assign the account in ch. 21 to E, and the account in this chapter to J. But this is altogether incorrect. The two accounts are interdependent and supplementary. The dependence of this chapter on ch. 21 is evident. Doeg is here introduced as a person already known to the reader (cf. above § 61). The clause **זה הוא נצב וכו'** is not intended to describe the person of Doeg, but only to explain his presence at the court, like the explanation of his presence at Nob given in 21. 8 a. **צירה** in ver. 10, and **טהר** in ver. 13, evidently refer back to 21. 4 f. It is true that here the bread is not described as sacred, but that is because it is immaterial to the charge of conspiracy brought against the priest, whether the bread was sacred or profane. It is also possible that Doeg did not see what kind of bread the priest had given to David. Likewise, **חרב** (גָּלִית) **הפלשתי** in ver. 10, and **חרב** in ver. 13 are dependent on 21. 10. The particular detail that the sword was that of the Philistine champion is, perhaps, mentioned by Doeg, in order to make sure that the king will believe him, as it might have been known that the sanctuary did not harbour within it any weapons (cf. Exod. 20. 25). Perhaps also Doeg intended to intensify the king's resentment by the allusion to the famous exploit of David, which was the first cause of the king's jealousy and hatred. It is characteristic that Saul himself says only **זה נצב וכו'** without **הפלשתי** (ver. 13), being unable to recall with his own lips the great achievement of his hated rival. Budde (*op. cit.*, 226) says that ver. 10 b 'hinkt . . . störend nach'. As a matter of fact this clause, with the verb at the end, is intended to be very emphatic and impressive. On the other hand, ch. 22

gives an additional detail not found in ch. 21, viz. the inquiry of the oracle. But, as we have stated before (§ 61), 21. 10 ends rather abruptly, and seems to be fragmentary. It may be that our author purposely omitted this detail in ch. 21 because he knew that the reader would learn it from ch. 22, where it would have to be mentioned as one of the chief counts in the indictment against the priest (cf. 22. 15); whereas in ch. 21, which tells the story from David's point of view, the inquiry of the oracle was of minor importance. Bread and a sword were to David in his plight a more vital necessity than an inquiry of the oracle. Thus, just as ch. 22 presupposes ch. 21, so ch. 21 presupposes ch. 22, which proves that both chapters are by one and the same hand, viz. by the author of our book.

65. Critics hold ver. 19 to be an interpolation modelled on 15. 3 b, because the verse interrupts the connexion between ver. 18 and ver. 20, and because its statement is improbable. One may ask: if this is not the right place for the verse, where else could the writer have placed it? Not before ver. 18, nor far down below after ver. 23, nor anywhere between vers. 20–23. The argument that Doeg could not have slain single-handed all the inhabitants of Nob is of no force. **נָבָנִים** need not mean that Doeg slew them all with his own hand any more than, for example, **נָבָל** in 15. 7 means that Saul slew all the Amalekites with his own hand. The king's attendants may have hesitated to lay their hands on the priests; but this hesitation of the courtiers would not have prevented Doeg from obtaining outside the court plenty of assistance in his nefarious work. The occurrence of the phraseology of this verse in 15. 3 b only strengthens our contention that both ch. 15 and ch. 22 emanate from one and the same author. Note the omission

here of נַמְלֵל given in 15. 3 b. Camels were an important possession of the marauding Amalekites (cf. 30. 17, &c.), but useless to the settled priests of Nob, and therefore not found among their cattle.

66. (ch. 23.) 23. 1-13 is evidently by our author. Note the references in ver. 3 to 22. 5; in vers. 6, 9 b to 22. 20 ff., and in vers. 7 ff. to 22. 6. Ver. 6, which seeks to explain how David came to possess an ephod, may very well belong to the author, and need not be a gloss. Naturally it had to precede ver. 9 b, but in order that it may not interrupt the context it is placed at the beginning of the paragraph. The contention of the critics that this verse should have preceded ver. 2 is of no force. There were other means of inquiring of God besides the ephod. The inquiry in ver. 2 may have been made through the prophet Gad. Ver. 14 is, as shown by clause *b*, a summary of the history of David during the whole period. David dwelt in the wilderness, namely, in the fastnesses; he dwelt in the high land, namely, in the wilderness of Ziph.³⁵ Ver. 15, where we should point with LXX אַרְגָּן for M.T. אַרְגָּן, is introductory to vers. 16-18: David was afraid of Saul while he was in Horshah in the wilderness, and Jonathan came out to him and encouraged him, and concluded a covenant with him. We hold that this passage belongs to our author. Hitherto the author has not recorded the well-known fact of the existence of a covenant between David and Jonathan (cf. II. 9. 3; 21. 7); for, as we have shown above (§§ 52, 58), 18. 3, 20. 10 are not the author's, but belong to interpolations. In view of the breach between Saul and Jonathan

³⁵ בְּמִזְרָחָה is obviously a more comprehensive term than בְּמִרְכָּבָה. Similarly בְּהָר 'the mountainous region', comprised a wider area than בְּמִרְכָּבָה זִיפָּה.

revealed by 22. 8 (cf. also 20. 30 ff.), we need not be surprised that Jonathan dared to visit David in defiance of his father.

67. Ver. 19 is found again in a shorter form in 26. 1. Since, as we shall show later (§ 72), ch. 26 was embodied by our author in his work from an older source, we may conclude that he deliberately borrowed the phraseology of ver. 19 from 26. 1. That our verse is not a *duplicate* of 26. 1, as the critics assert, is evident from the fact that the story which it introduces in vers. 20–28 has nothing in common with the story of ch. 26. The narrative of vers. 19–28 seems to be the sequel of ver. 14 above, and is intended to illustrate the statement in ver. 14 b. We see no reason to deny the passage to our author. Ver. 19 b is best interpreted as follows: David hides himself in our region, now in the fastnesses, now in Horshah, now in the hill of the Ḥakilah. Had the latter two localities been intended to serve as a specification of the first (= במצוות) they would no doubt have been introduced by the relative אשר, like the last clause of the verse (כימין הישמן). This interpretation is further supported by the request of Saul that they should return and find out the exact spot in which David was hiding. If the Ziphites had only mentioned one locality as David's hiding-place, and had, moreover, added the names of other places in order to describe and specify its exact situation, then the whole of Saul's speech in vers. 22, 23 would seem both superfluous and irrational.

68. (ch. 24.) In ch. 24 the author continues the story of David's adventures. The critics have denied the integrity of vers. 5–8. They hold that the present order of the verses is unnatural. Hence some of them propose the

following rearrangement: vers. 5 a, 7, 8 a, 5 b, 6, 8 b. This new order seems at first sight plausible enough. But the question arises, as H. P. Smith (*op. cit.*, 217) observes, how did this complicated dislocation arise, and what was its cause? Further, we may ask, how did the writer divine that David had felt in his heart remorse for cutting off the skirt of Saul's mantle (ver. 6), unless David had evinced this feeling by some speech or act, as is really the case in our present text, where he gives expression to this feeling by his speech in ver. 7? H. P. Smith seeks to solve the difficulty in the usual fashion of the critics: he holds the incident of the cutting off of the skirt of Saul's mantle to be a later invention, and proposes to cut out as an interpolation vers. 5 b, 6, and also ver. 12, which, he says, 'is as readily spared as vers. 5 b, 6'. But ver. 12 cannot be spared. For ver. 13 a can have sense and force only after ver. 12 b, where David demonstrates his own innocence and also charges Saul with seeking his life. No such charge is brought against Saul in ver. 11. Again, it will not do even if we delete only the first half of ver. 12 (up to **הַרְנַתְךָ**); for **רֹא** presupposes a demonstrative proof of his innocence, such as is produced only by ver. 12 a. As a matter of fact, the present order of the verses is not unnatural. It is both rational and true psychologically. The alleged difficulties are simply the creation of the critics themselves. The course of the narrative is as follows: Saul enters the cave, in the recesses of which David and his men lie in hiding (ver. 4). David is urged by his men to slay Saul with his own hand (= **לְשַׁׁחַד**, ver. 5). Moved by their words and by his own impulse David rises and approaches Saul stealthily, but his chivalry and magnanimity are suddenly aroused, and he shrinks from the dishonourable act of slaying his enemy by

stealth. All that he can bring himself to do is to cut off the skirt of Saul's mantle (ver. 5). But even this harmless deed arouses in his generous heart feelings of self-reproach and shame (ver. 6). He returns to his men and explains that he cannot bring himself to lay hands on the 'Anointed of the Lord' (ver. 7), and energetically prevents them from attacking the unsuspecting king (ver. 8). The cutting off of the skirt is thus seen to be an essential detail of the story. It may also have been intended to bear a symbolic significance, like the rending of the mantle in 15. 27-8; 1 Kings 11. 30-31.

69. All the critics agree that ver. 14 is a gloss. They argue that David would not have chosen that moment for displaying his familiarity with the gnomic wisdom of the ancients. But the speech ascribed to David is not intended to be regarded as a stenographic report of what David actually said on the occasion. Hebrew authors may, like Thucydides and Livy, have put speeches of their own composition into the mouths of their heroes. Why should not the narrator, desirous of impressing a moral lesson on the minds of his readers, have put such a proverb into the mouth of David? And if this verse be a gloss, how is one to explain the repetition in clause *b* of ver. 13 *b*? H. P. Smith objects that David would not dare to call Saul *עִזָּן*. But David does not mean to brand Saul as wicked. He cites the proverb that evil brings its own punishment³⁶ only in order to explain his own assurance, in ver. 13 *a*, and to warn Saul that a wicked act against him would inevitably bring upon its doer condign retribution.

Budde (*op. cit.*, 229) condemns also vers. 21-23 *a* as redactional. These verses may not, indeed, be quite historical,

³⁶ Cf. the Rabbinic comment in *Makkot* 10 *b*.

but there is no reason why the original narrator should not have shared the general belief of his contemporaries that even at that early stage of his career David had already been recognized by Saul himself as the only legitimate successor to the throne of Israel. Cf. our remarks above, § 25.

70. (ch. 25.) Ch. 25 stands out from among the other chapters of this section by its distinctive individuality of style and diction. The narrative is rich in detail and in local colour, full of life and movement, and distinguished by a number of characteristic phrases and expressions. Note ver. 3: רֹעֵם מְעָלִים; ver. 6; ver. 8: יְמֵם טוֹב; ver. 12: ; ver. 14: וַיַּעֲטֵב בָּהּ; ver. 26: וְהַוְשֵׁעַ יְדֵךְ לְךָ; ver. 29 b. We have, however, no reason to deny the chapter to our author; we should rather conclude that he utilized some older written material, from which he derived the most characteristic portions of his narrative. Cf. vers. 42-4 with 27. 3; 30. 5; II. 3. 2-3, 13 ff. The critics agree that ver. 1 a is an interpolation from 28. 3. But what is the purpose of this interpolation here? Only one of them has attempted an answer to this question, viz. Budde (*op. cit.*, 231), who thinks that the interpolation was made in order not to let the reader lose sight of the nation. But why should this reminder of the existence of the nation, if such reminder was necessary, have been made exactly here, and not in any other of the many chapters since ch. 18? We think it likely that there was in the mind of the writer some connexion between the two clauses of this verse. It seems that he meant to imply that through Samuel's death David enjoyed in the wilderness of Ma'on (LXX) a period of rest from Saul's persecution. It may be that Samuel's death kept Saul back from pursuing David. Samuel's followers, the prophets and the priests, who were friendly to David, may, perhaps, have

begun to show signs of restiveness now that the calming influence of Samuel had been removed. For with all his opposition to Saul, Samuel retained to the end of his life a certain personal attachment to the man he had raised to the throne of Israel ; cf. 15. 11, 35. On the other hand, it is also possible that the connexion between clause *a* and clause *b* of this verse is purely of a chronological character. In any case, it is certain that the critics are wrong in regarding clause *a* as being derived from 28. 3a. On the contrary, the statement seems to be original here, where it occupies the place of a principal affirmation in the course of the historical narrative, whereas in 28. 3 it serves, like the following clause, merely a subordinate purpose, viz. to prepare the reader for the story of the raising of Samuel's spirit by the necromancer.

71. Budde (*loc. cit.*) is of opinion that originally 25. 2 ff. followed immediately upon 23. 28. But the sense of security and repose which characterizes ch. 25 is out of accord with the trepidation and hairbreadth escapes of ch. 23. From 25. 7 b, 15-16 it is obvious that David and his men had stayed in one locality for a considerable length of time, and had freely and openly fraternized with the natives. This is quite intelligible after the assurance given by Saul in 24. 17-22, but is inconsistent with 23. 19, 22, 23, where David is described as hiding in secret retreats and in danger of being betrayed by the natives.

72. (chs. 24, 26.) The striking similarities between ch. 26 and ch. 24 present an interesting problem as to the origin and mutual relationship of the two chapters. The critics solve the problem by their usual method of declaring the two accounts to be independent duplicates of the same story. At first sight this solution seems quite plausible,

but a closer comparison of the two chapters proves it to be altogether inadequate to account for all the facts of the problem. Let us examine both the similarities and the differences of the two stories. The main outline of the adventure is common to both stories. In both stories David gets Saul into his power without the king's knowing it, and his men seek to slay Saul stealthily, but David prevents them. When Saul is out of danger David proves to him his innocence, and complains of Saul's ceaseless persecutions, and Saul confesses his guilt. There are also striking similarities in language ; cf. . . שָׁלַשׁ אֲלָפִים אִישׁ בָּחָור . . יִשְׂרָאֵל in 26. 2 and 24. 3 ; שָׁבַע אֶת דָּרָךְ in 26. 3 b with 24. 4 b ; 26. 11 a with 24. 7 ; 26. 17 with 24. 17 ; 26. 20 b with 24. 15. On the other hand, there are also important differences in the general presentation of the story and in the details. The temper of the two men is differently represented in each of the stories. In 24 David's speech is very bitter and almost vindictive (vers. 10-16) ; in 26, on the other hand, it is respectful and supplicatory (vers. 18-20). Again, in 24 Saul is profuse, humble, and remorseful (vers. 18-22) ; in 26 he is brief and dignified (ver. 21). Further, the style in 24 is diffuse and verbose as compared with the conciseness and terseness of 26. There are also marked differences in the details of the story. 26 takes place in the wilderness of Ziph, 24 in the wilderness of Engedi. In 26 it is the Ziphites who betray David, in 24 the informers are unnamed. In 26 David, accompanied only by one follower, goes down to the encampment of Saul ; in 24 Saul comes to the hiding-place of David and all his band. In 26 the proof of David's innocence is the spear and pitcher of water ; in 24 it is the skirt of the king's mantle. In 26 it is Abishai

who wishes to slay the king ; in 24 David is incited to slay him with his own hand. In 26 David first addresses Abner, and the king only after the latter had spoken to him ; in 24 David addresses Saul straightway, and Abner's presence is entirely ignored. Now, the identity of the main outline certainly proves the original identity of the adventure. On the other hand, the differences in detail preclude the assumption that the two accounts in their literary form are both derived from a common source, or that one account is derived from the other. Yet the linguistic similarities demonstrate the dependence of one account upon the other, viz. the dependence of ch. 24 upon ch. 26, which is no doubt the older of the stories.³⁷ The only solution which will satisfy all the facts of the problem is the following : The writer of ch. 24, who, as we remarked above (§ 68), is the author of our book, knew ch. 26 in its present literary form from some old document. But he also knew from oral tradition a story of a similar character, which, however, contained so many striking differences in detail as to lead him to believe that the two stories were not identical, and that David and Saul really had two such adventures. Judging by our modern criteria of historical criticism, we may think that this belief of his was wrong ; but we have no right to impose our modern ideas upon an ancient writer, and to assert, as the critics seem to do, that his belief in the independence of the two stories was unjustifiable and impossible from his own point of view. The story which he found in his old source he reproduced in ch. 26, but the story which he derived from oral tradition he related in his own words in ch. 24. In this latter composi-

³⁷ Cf. Thenius-Löhr, *Samuel*, XLV ; H. P. Smith, *op. cit.*, 230 ; Stenning, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. IV, 338 a.

tion he was, consciously or unconsciously, strongly influenced by the phraseology of the older story; hence the linguistic similarities between ch. 26 and ch. 24. We have already found our author elsewhere repeating in his own compositions phrases and expressions belonging to the older documents which he incorporated into his narrative; cf. 10. 23 b with 9. 2 b; 15. 19 b with 14. 32 a; 16. 12 a with 17. 42 b; 23. 19 with 26. 1 (see §§ 28, 50, 67). We should, of course, expect 26. 1 to begin with וַיַּבְאֵן וַיְשִׁבֵּן הַזֶּה, but our author seems to have left the expression as he found it in his document either through an oversight, or because he was unwilling to tamper with the text of the document. The assumption that the author of our book is responsible for the appearance in his narrative of both ch. 24 and ch. 26 will help to explain the resentful tone of David's speech in 24. 10-16 as compared with the more calm and respectful tone of his speech in 26. 18-20. In ch. 24 his mind was still full of the bitter feelings engendered by Saul's pursuit described just before in 23. 25-8. In ch. 26, on the other hand, David was still fresh from the enjoyment of a long repose in the wilderness of Ma'on (ch. 25).³⁸ These facts will also account for the difference in the bearing of Saul in ch. 24 and ch. 26.

73. This solution of ours is also strongly supported by another consideration. According to the analysis of the critics, 23. 19-24. 23 is the duplicate of ch. 26. The Ziphites thus informed against David only once, and Saul confessed his guilt only once. If so, it is incomprehensible that after the assurance just given in 26. 21, 25, an assurance which had never yet been broken, David suddenly despairs

³⁸ It is possible that the source used by the author in his composition of ch. 25 (cf. above § 71) was the same as that from which he derived ch. 26.

so utterly of his safety that he resolves upon taking the desperate step of going over to the hereditary foe, the heathen Philistines, among whom he would be forced, as he says himself (26. 19), to abjure his God (27. 1 ff.). But according to our explanation David's resolve becomes quite clear and intelligible. He had been pursued by Saul on three occasions, in 23. 19-28, in ch. 24, and in ch. 26. He had been three times betrayed by his neighbours, and twice by the same people, the Ziphites (23. 19; 24. 2 b; 26. 1). Saul's promises and confessions had been proved to be deceptive: the promise made in Engedi (24. 18-22) had been broken by the subsequent pursuit into the wilderness of Ziph (26. 2 ff.). Most of the natives of the Negeb were hostile and ungrateful, like Nabal (25. 10), or treacherous like the Ziphites. In these circumstances, with the repeated experience of danger and betrayal, it is quite natural and intelligible for David to despair of the future safety of himself, his wives, and his followers in the land of the Judean Negeb, and to resolve upon taking the extreme step of flight into the land of the Philistines.

74. (ch. 27.) The author continues his narrative in ch. 27. Some critics have questioned the integrity of the chapter. They hold that ver. 11 contradicts vers. 5-6. But ver. 11 says only that David had to bring his spoil to Akish at Gath, not that David lived at Gath. Had David been living at Gath, his duplicity towards the king would no doubt have been soon discovered either by betrayal or by an unguarded remark from his men. That David refrained in his raids from attacking his own tribesmen and their allies is only what we should expect of him. This consideration for his own people is also confirmed by 30. 26; cf. also 25. 15-16, 21, 28 ('ה מלכיות, viz. against

the heathen enemies of the Judeans and their allies). The confidence placed in David by Akish (ver. 12; 29. 3, 6, 9), and the ignorance of the Philistines of the real character of David's expeditions, prove conclusively that David lived at Ziklag and not at Gath. Hence vers. 7-12 presuppose vers. 5-6—which proves the unity of the whole chapter. David's residence at Ziklag is also confirmed by 29. 4 and ch. 30. This disposes of H. P. Smith's conjecture that vers. 5-6 are an interpolation.³⁹

75. (chs. 28-31.) The story of Saul's death in his last war with the Philistines includes two episodes, viz. Saul's interview with the spirit of Samuel (28. 3-25) and the Amalekite raid on Ziklag (ch. 30). The latter, being part of the story of David, forms undoubtedly an integral portion of our section. Chs. 29-30 are, therefore, by the same hand as 28. 1-2, and as these two verses are the sequel of ch. 27, we may safely assign 28. 1-2 and chs. 29-30 to the author of our book. As regards the other episode, critics are agreed that it is an interpolation from another document, but on very insufficient evidence. They argue that the passage breaks the context, but that is natural to an episode. Again, they point out that the tone and style are different from those of the preceding and following pieces; but that, too, is adequately accounted for by the profound difference of the subject-matter. Finally, the critics discover a discrepancy between this piece and ch. 29. Here in ver. 4 the Philistines are encamped at Shunem and the Israelites at Gilboa, whereas in 29. 1 the Philistines are at Aphek and the Israelites at some fountain in Jezreel. But the fact is that 28. 4-25 is posterior in time to ch. 29, as is evident

³⁹ Cf. also Kamphausen in *ZATW.*, 1886, pp. 90 ff., and Budde, *op. cit.*, 231 f.

from 28. 5, where Saul was already surveying the Philistine camp. Ch. 29 describes the situation at the opening of the campaign and the mobilization of the Philistine hosts, while 28. 4 shows us the position of the two armies at the eve of the battle; cf. 28. 19 . . . וּמָחָר אַתָּה. Aphek (probably identical with the one mentioned in 4. 1) served as the place of muster for the various Philistine armies: 29. 1 does not say that the Philistines *encamped* at Aphek, only that their hosts assembled there for the purpose of moving northwards, while Jezreel was the place of the first encampment of the Israelites. When the Philistines marched from Aphek on Jezreel (29. 11 b), the Israelites, out of fear of the enemy, moved backwards to Gilboa, south-east of Jezreel. The Philistines then, for some strategical reason, moved up farther north to Shunem, where they pitched their encampment (28. 4), and from there pushed back southwards to attack the Israelites on the heights of Gilboa (31. 1; II. 1. 21).

76. The nocturnal scene at Endor must have taken place at the time of David's fight with the Amalekites, which latter occurred three days after David had left Aphek (cf. the chronological references in 30. 1 a, 13 b β ; II. 1. 1 b-2 a), but before 30. 26. For this reason the author placed the story of Endor where he did, and not after ch. 30, as Budde has injudiciously done in his badly deranged text in Haupt's Polychrome Bible. Besides this chronological reason, the author also had an aesthetic reason for placing 28. 3-25 before chs. 29-30, viz. to afford the reader some relief in chs. 29-30 between the depressing effects of the ghostly scene at Endor and the gory battlefield of Gilboa in ch. 31. Chs. 29-30 are thus treated by the author as an episode and a break in the course of his narrative. This explains

the wording of the opening clause of ch. 31 as a subordinate statement: 'פְּלִשְׁתִּים נָלחְמִים' 'The Philistines *were fighting*', viz. during the time covered by the preceding account; cf. Rashi's note *ad loc.*: בַּאֲדָם הָאֹמֵר נָחוֹר לְעַנֵּן רַאשֵּׁן. On the other hand, the Chronicler, who had not previously mentioned anything of the Philistine war, makes of these words a principal statement, using the perfect tense: 'נָלחָמוּ'. This disposes of H. P. Smith's hasty conjecture (*op. cit.*, 252) that our text in 31. 1 requires emendation in accordance with the reading of the Chronicler (1 Chron. 10. 1). We, therefore, see no reason to deny 28. 3-25 to the author of our book, to whom this scene must have appeared as the final and supreme climax in the story of his great hero, the prophet Samuel. It is admitted by practically all critics⁴⁰ that this story is by the same hand as ch. 15. In fact, 28. 17 points back expressly to 15. 28. But we have already assigned ch. 15 to the author of our book (§ 50). Hence we conclude that this story, as well as the rest of the section comprising chs. 28-31, is the work of our author. This view is supported by the use of סָךְ in vers. 15, 16, which reminds us of 16. 14, 23, and by the introductory character of vers. 3-4. The latter is evidently an essential part of the story and not the work of an interpolator. On the other hand, vers. 18-19 seems to have suffered expansion by a late hand. Ver. 18 is rather diffuse, and clause *b* in ver. 19 is practically a repetition of the first part of clause *a*. Perhaps the whole of vers. 18-19 *a a* (to פְּלִשְׁתִּים) is a later addition.

77. (II. ch. 1.) The narrative of Saul's death is continued in II. 1, which describes the reception of the news by David. The chapter is homogeneous, and as it continues the story of i. 31 it must be assigned to the author of our book.

⁴⁰ Budde (*op. cit.*, 233) is the only exception.

Ver. 4 is reminiscent in its phraseology and climactic arrangement of I. 4. 16 b-17 (cf. Ralbag's note *ad loc.*). With ver. 14 compare I. 24. 7; 26. 9, 11. Some critics, however, hold that vers. 6-11, 13-16 belong to another document; that ver. 5 is a redactional link connecting vers. 1-4, which form the continuation of I. 31, with the contradictory account given in the interpolation, vers. 6-11, 13-16, while ver. 12 is a later addition, because lamentation and fasting were at the stage of that verse still premature. But, as H. P. Smith asks (*op. cit.*, 254), where did vers. 6-11, 13-16 come from? We may further ask, what was the original continuation of ver. 4? It could not have been ver. 17, for we require first some such statement as is contained in ver. 11; much less could it have been 2. 1, even if we omit יְהִי אַחֲרֵיכֶם; for David would certainly have paid some honour to the fallen heroes before proceeding to utilize the new situation for his own benefit. Finally, is it likely that in this alleged original document to which vers. 1-4 belong, David accepted the truth of the tidings in ver. 4 without adequate proof, and without inquiring for further details? The truth is, that we obtain a logical and consistent account of the affair only if we accept vers. 1-17 as one continuous and homogeneous narrative. After the man's general statement in ver. 4, David naturally inquires for the source of his knowledge (ver. 5). The answer to this is given in vers. 6-10. Convinced of the truth of the death of Saul and Jonathan by the irrefutable evidence supplied by the man's producing Saul's regalia, David and his men perform the usual rites of mourning over the fallen heroes (vers. 11-12). Then, as part of the reparation due to the *manes* of the slain king, David punishes the Amalekite for his self-confessed crime (vers. 13-16), and finally pro-

ceeds to pronounce on the heroes the dirge of lamentation which usually accompanied the dead to the grave (cf. 3. 33; 1 Kings 13. 30, &c.).

78. The reason which has compelled the critics to mutilate our chapter is the contradiction between the account of Saul's death in 1. 31 and the report of the Amalekite. The easiest way for our critics to overcome the difficulty is by resorting to their usual contrivance of postulating two different documents with redactional links and additions. But the fact is, as already noted by Qimhi and Ralbag, that the Amalekite's story in vers. 6-10 a is a pure fabrication. The narrator does not, indeed, say so explicitly, but there is no need for such an explicit statement, since the lie has just been given to the Amalekite's story in the narrator's own account in 1. 31. No one except perhaps a modern Bible critic, whose constitutional scepticism is sometimes balanced by an astounding gullibility, would be taken in by the tissue of falsehoods which the brazen-faced Amalekite sought to palm off on David. His lies stare one in the face. First, he did not, as he says, come to Gilboa by mere chance (נִקְרָא נִקְרָא, ver. 6). He came there either as a combatant, or as a thief to strip the dead and wounded. Secondly, he could not have managed to get right into the thick of the battle—also by mere chance!—and penetrate through the chariots and horsemen, so as to reach the wounded king. Thirdly, if the king had already been overtaken by the enemy's cavalry, he would not have had the time to engage the Amalekite in a conversation (vers. 7-9). Fourthly, Saul would not have been deserted by all his own men and forced to solicit help from the Amalekite; at least his armour-bearer would have remained by his side, as in fact he did (1. 31. 4-5). It is evident that the

Amalekite was a member of some band of robbers, who, like vultures, usually haunted the battlefields and preyed upon the dead and wounded. He succeeded in discovering the body of the dead king before the Philistines (I. 31. 8), stripped him, and carried the royal insignia to David in expectation of a rich reward. The narrator does not say that David really believed the *details* of the Amalekite's story. David accepted only the truth of the general statement of the defeat of the Israelites, which he must have expected himself, and of the death of Saul as testified by the Amalekite's possession of the regalia. Perhaps he also believed it possible that the Amalekite had found Saul lying mortally wounded and had dispatched him of his own accord (vers. 14–16).

79. Budde (*op. cit.*, 238) and other critics regard 4. 10 as contradictory to our account here, since there David kills the Amalekite with his own hand, whereas here (ver. 15) he has him killed by one of his men. They think, therefore, that 4. 10 is based upon a different document, and that originally some such account as in 4. 10 followed here between ver. 10 and ver. 17, which, however, had been suppressed by the redactor in favour of the account in vers. 6–16. But surely 4. 10 is not a complete statement of the incident. For even assuming that it is based on a different document, that hypothetical document could not have said what 4. 10 says, that David slew the bearer of tidings for no other cause than that of having brought him the news of Saul's death. Was death the usual reward for bringing the tidings of the death of a king? Or was David a bloodthirsty tyrant, to slay innocent people for his mere pleasure? It is plain that the bearer of tidings must have been guilty of something more criminal than anything men-

tioned in 4. 10, though not so criminal as the act of Rekab and Ba'anah. If, then, 4. 10 is incomplete, and the real cause of David's action was some unnamed crime committed by the man, there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that 4. 10 refers back to 1. 15-16, and that the real cause of the man's death was as stated in our narrative here. The critics have been misled by the literal interpretation of *הוֹמָא* in 4. 10. But that expression need not mean that David slew the man with his own hand, any more than, for example, *בָּנָה* in 5. 9 means that David built his fortress with his own hands (cf. above, § 65). Assuming, therefore, as we must, that 4. 10 points back to our passage here, it is noteworthy that in the outburst of his passionate indignation David reports the words of the Amalekite as *הַנָּה מִת שָׁאֹל*, and not *'שׁ מִת שָׁאֹל*. This seems to confirm our view that David did not really believe the details of the Amalekite's story in vers. 6-10 a.

The insertion of the elegy in vers. 19-27 was probably made by the author himself, like the similar insertion of the elegy on Abner in 3. 33-4. For a discussion of the original form of the elegy, see the writer's paper in this REVIEW, vol. V, pp. 202-8.

DAVID AND ISHBOSHETH.

80. (ch. 2.) The story of David's accession to the throne, first of Judah, and then of all Israel, contained in chs. 2-5. 5, must as a whole be assigned to the author of our book. 2. 2 refers back to I. 25. 42-3: 2. 4 f. to I. 31. 11-13; and 3. 13 f. to I. 18. 27; 25. 44. The author may, however, have used some older material, particularly in his account of the fight at Gibeon. It is also possible that the critics are right in regarding the chronological notes

in 2. 10, 11 as a later addition, similar to I. 13. 1. It has been argued by the critics that Ishbosheth must have been a minor when he succeeded to the throne of Israel, since he did not accompany his father to Gilboa. But we have no evidence that he was not present at Gilboa. He might have escaped the slaughter of his brothers. And if he did not go to the war, it was perhaps due to his lack of physical courage rather than to his youthfulness. His remonstrance with Abner in 3. 7 would lead us to think that he had already reached manhood. Note also his description as צדיק איש in 4. 11. Nevertheless, he does not seem to have been as old as forty years on his accession (2. 10), i. e. ten years older than David. For in this case the difference in age between David and Jonathan, the eldest son of Saul, would have been rather too great to allow for such a warm and intimate friendship as existed between them.

81. Budde (*op. cit.*, 240) regards 2. 14–16 as an interpolation. He thinks that the story of the twenty-four champions was invented to explain the name of the field (ver. 16 b), and that ver. 17 originally followed immediately on ver. 13. But it is difficult to see how the battle in ver. 17 ff. could have developed out of ver. 13 b. If the two rival hosts had deliberately come out to fight, the narrator would have said in ver. 13 b נִנְחָנוּ, and not שָׁבְנוּ. We want an explanation of the immediate cause of the outbreak of hostilities. For it is apparent from vers. 22 b β , 26 that Abner had entered on the fight unwillingly and unpreparedly. And the ready consent of Joab to stop the fighting (ver. 27) proves that Joab, too, did not come out originally with the set purpose of fighting a battle. It is evident, therefore, that the outbreak of the fighting was unexpected and against the wish of the generals, and must

therefore have been due to some chance incident such as that described in vers. 14-16, which inflamed the passions both of the men and of their leaders. It is, however, possible that there is a lacuna between ver. 16 and ver. 17. For we expect a statement that the fatal play had led to a quarrel and to mutual recriminations, which resulted in a pitched battle between the rival hosts. Perhaps the author derived his account from an older source, which he abridged, as he did, for example, in I. 10. 7 ff. (cf. above, § 48).

82. (ch. 3.) Critics have denied the integrity of this chapter, but on insufficient evidence. They hold that vers. 2-5 are a late redactional insertion removed here from behind 8. 15, whither they also propose to transfer 5. 13-16. It is very magnanimous on their part to credit the ancient Hebrew writer with so much of their own Germanic sense of method and orderliness as to assert that he must have placed all these lists together, but truth forces us to decline the flattering compliment. For it is hard to see why a redactor should have transferred these lists from ch. 8 to their present places. The fact is that 3. 2-5 is quite in its right place here, and is the work of the author of the rest of the chapter, who intended the list to illustrate the growing strength of David (ver. 1 b a. Cf., for example, Esther 5. 11 a). Dr. H. P. Smith conjectures that two different documents have been joined together in the account of the negotiations between David and Abner. 'One of the two accounts made Abner send to David by the hand of messengers; the other made him come in person. In the former document his motive was simply the conviction that David was the man of the future. The other gave the quarrel with Ishbaal as the occasion' (*op. cit.*, 275). But it must be doubted whether any document would

have represented Abner as a selfish traitor ready to betray his weak *protégé* Ishbosheth and the whole house of Saul for no cause whatever except his own personal advantage. The change in Abner's attitude to Ishbosheth must have been the result of some very powerful motive, such as is supplied by our narrative in ver. 7 ff. Again, is it likely that Abner would have been represented as coming personally to David, after the long war which he had waged against him (ver. 1), without first obtaining through some trusted messengers a guarantee against violence to his person? Finally, the fact that Abner's visit to David took place during Joab's absence proves conclusively that this meeting between David and Abner had been fully arranged beforehand through ambassadors.

83. Equally groundless is the theory of others that vers. 12–16 are an interpolation. It is impossible to believe that Abner would have begun his agitation among the elders in favour of David before he had concluded a secret agreement with David. 'Why should David send to Ishbaal for Michal when, as we learn from ver. 13, the marriage was to confirm the *secret* alliance which Abner was seeking with David?'⁴¹ The answer is, that Paltiel would not have given up his wife, to whom he was so deeply attached (ver. 16), except at the bidding of his king—Ishbosheth. David insisted on the restoration of Michal as a preliminary to the negotiations with Abner. The only way to secure her restoration without using forcible means was for David to make a formal demand to Ishbosheth (ver. 14), and for Abner to press his weak master to accede to the demand of his powerful rival. The procedure must have been arranged secretly through the ambassadors

⁴¹ S. A. Cook, *AJSL.*, *ibid.*, p. 149.

between David and Abner. That Abner accompanied Michal as far as Bahurim (ver. 16 b) is only what we would expect, considering the rank of Michal and his own anxiety to secure the satisfaction of David's demand. Perhaps the arrival of Michal at Hebron coincided with the visit of Abner to David described in ver. 20. If so, vers. 17-19 a would be anterior to ver. 16, but this is not likely. Further, we need not be surprised that the narrator omitted to describe Michal's arrival at Hebron. For the whole Michal episode is given here not for its own sake, but only as a sequel to I. 18. 27; 19. 11-17; 25. 44, and as an introduction to II. 6. 16 ff.

84. The critics also declare ver. 30 to be an interpolation, without, however, giving a valid reason for this view. The verse may very well be by the hand of our author, and be intended as a summary of the narrative, after the usual fashion of Biblical writers, and also to explain that the murder was an act of blood revenge on behalf of the whole family. For this reason Abishai is coupled with Joab in the act. And though he did not actually assist in the murder, yet he must have been privy to Joab's design. That Joab did not act for himself alone, but for the whole of his family, is proved by the fact that David's curse is called down not only upon the head of Joab, but also upon the whole house of his father (ver. 29 a; cf. also ver. 39: *בני צדקה*).

85. (ch. 4.) Critics have failed to understand the meaning of 4. 2-3, and, as usual in such a case, have questioned the genuineness of these verses. Rimmon, as shown by his name, which is that of the Syrian storm god, was a Canaanite, or, more exactly, a Hivvite. When Saul destroyed the Gibeonites (21. 1) he must also have attacked their confederates, the Beerothites (cf. Josh. 9. 17, &c.).

Therefore the Beerothites with Rimmon among them fled to Gittaim, where they lived as *gerim*, retaining the name Beerothites. In the course of time the sons of Rimmon became officers of Ishbosheth, and ultimately murdered him, no doubt as an act of blood revenge. The writer describes them as מבני בנימין. But as they were really Hivvites, he adds in self-correction that they are reckoned to Benjamin, not because they are Benjamites, but only because Beeroth is reckoned a part of Benjamite territory (ver. 2).

86. The critics hold ver. 4 also to be an interpolation. According to most of them, it stood originally after 9. 3 in the answer of Ziba to David's inquiry. But this is altogether improbable. The answers of Ziba to the king's questions in 9. 2, 4 are fittingly very brief. It is not likely that he would have launched forth into such a long statement about Mephibosheth as that contained in 4. 4 b without having been asked by the king to do so. Again, if our verse originally stood after 9. 3, why was it transferred here to a place which, according to the critics, is much less appropriate for it? There can be no doubt that our verse was placed here by the author, though he may have derived it from some old source. For 4. 1-4 is really introductory and preparatory to the narrative of the death of Ishbosheth and the accession of David to the throne of Saul (4. 5—5. 3). 4. 1 describes the state of alarm and confusion which followed on Abner's death, and emboldened the Beerothites to commit their nefarious deed. Vers. 2-3 describe the murderers, as introductory to vers. 5-12, while ver. 4 describes the helplessness of the sole remaining heir to Saul's throne. Because of this helplessness he failed to take possession of the vacant throne, and therefore the

tribes of Israel were forced to turn to David and invite him to become their king.⁴² This verse is, therefore, introductory to 5. 1-3, and as such is an integral and necessary part of the author's narrative.

מונה והולך איך נשבת[ה] מלכות מבית שאול הוא
ובניו נחרנו וזה הנשאר הרגוו על משבבו וננו של יהונתן נפל ויפסח

(*To be continued.*)